

REMARKS

This paper is in response to the Office Action dated June 28, 2010 (the Action). Claims 1-19 are currently pending and have been restricted in the Action as set forth below.

Group I: Claims 1-7 and 15-19, drawn to a method for melting glass.

Group II: Claims 8-14, drawn to an induction melting furnace.

Applicants provisionally elect Group II (Claims 8-14) **with traverse**. In particular, Applicants submit that independent Claims 1, 8, 15 and 17 recite the common, novel and inventive feature of a switching element arranged to prevent or permit a mutual induction of current in a respective heating coil when an adjacent heating coil is energized according to a selected on or off status of the switching element (or an analogous method step). Accordingly, the mutual induction of current in adjacent non-energized coils may be prevented. Alternatively, when adjacent coils are energized together, power delivered to regions within the vessel associated with these coils is balanced. As such, a tighter temperature control may be achieved in some embodiments. *See* page 5, lines 20-31 of the application.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that the independent claims relate to a common general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1-13.2. Applicants request that the restriction requirement be withdrawn. Favorable examination of Claims 1-19 is respectfully requested.

It is further noted that the Action refers to German Patent Publication DE 307,044 to Krupfer et al. However, it is believed that the document referred to in the Action is actually document **GB**307044 to Krupfer (Krupfer). *See* Information Disclosure Statement filed April 11, 2006. For purposes of this discussion, Applicants will assume that the Action is referring to Krupfer, and clarification is respectfully requested. Although a rejection has not been made in the Action, Krupfer will now be discussed.

The Action takes the position that Krupfer teaches or renders obvious every feature of the apparatus as recited in Claim 8. However, the Action does not indicate which portion of Krupfer teaches or suggests "a switching element arranged to prevent or permit a mutual induction of current in a respective heating coil when an adjacent heating coil is energized according to a

In re: Tivey et al.
Application No.: 10/575,375
Filed: August 31, 2007
Page 7 of 7

selected on or off status of the switching element," but rather merely indicates generally that Krupfer discloses "a switching element (N, O, P) capable of energizing respective heating coils." *See* the Action, page 2.

Applicants submit that the switches of Krupfer are not arranged to prevent or permit a mutual induction of current in the respective heating coil when an adjacent heating coil is energized according to a selected on or off status of the switching element. In fact, Krupfer uses a previously known method of trying to separate induction currents using iron rings and different diameter furnace section. *See* col. 2, lines 60-63 and 71-78. The switches N, O, P are simply used in the apparatus of Krupfer to adjust power to the furnace. *See* col. 3, lines 25-31.

Therefore, Krupfer does not disclose or render obvious the above-mentioned recitation of independent Claim 8. Similarly, Krupfer does not disclose or render obvious analogous recitations of independent method Claims 1, 15 and 17.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0220.

Respectfully submitted,



Laura M. Kelley
Registration No. 48,441

Customer Number 20792

Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec, P.A.
P.O. Box 37428
Raleigh, NC 27627
919-854-1400
919-854-1401 (Fax)

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4) to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date below.

Signature: _____

Typed Name of Person Signing Certificate: Joyce Paoli

Date: December 22, 2010